arXiv:1403.4388v1 [gr-qc] 18 Mar 2014

Non-uniqueness of representation of generators of hypersurface deformations (or of generally covariant Lagrangians) for spherically symmetric spacetimes

Rakesh Tibrewala [1]

School of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, CET Campus, Trivandrum 695016, India

Abstract

The theorem of Hojman et. al. [1] says that the canonical representation of the generators of the hypersurface deformation algebra on the geometrodynamical phase space (subject to certain conditions) is unique and is the same as Einsteinian geometrodynamics. In the present work we show that, for spherically symmetric spacetimes, the representation is not unique. We construct the most general representation belonging to the class where the spherically symmetric Einstein-Hilbert theory is modified by the presence of $g_{\theta\theta}$-dependent factors and demonstrate that this representation is inequivalent to the one obtained from general relativity. In the Lagrangian language this implies that, as far as spherically symmetric spacetimes are concerned, the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian is not the only Lagrangian (not involving any higher derivative modifications) leading to a generally covariant theory for the dynamics of spacetime.

1 Introduction

According to the work of Hojman et. al. [1], there is not much freedom as far as the *canonical* form that a generally covariant theory obeying the surface deformation algebra can take. More precisely, their theorem says that the canonical representation of the generators of the deformations of a hypersurface (embedded in a Riemannian spacetime) on the phase space with the intrinsic metric of the hypersurface and its conjugate momentum as the sole canonical variables is unique and is precisely the one that follows from the Einstein-Hilbert action (if higher derivative terms are excluded).

The generator of the normal deformations of the hypersurface is the *super-Hamiltonian* (which, for reasons of consistency of the formalism, is constrained and is then called the Hamiltonian constraint). The generator of the tangential deformations is the *super-momentum* (which is constrained as well and is also known as the diffeomorphism constraint). The only freedom available is a canonical transformation affecting only the momenta conjugate to the intrinsic metric of the hypersurface with the new momenta differing from the old by a factor dependent only on the intrinsic geometry of the hypersurface.

Such a uniqueness has interesting consequences since it implies that (in 3+1 dimensions) the only dynamical theory of spacetime (including dynamical matter) which is consistent with the kinematics of surface deformation is Einstein's theory (with or without a cosmological constant, see [1]). In the quantum theory one would like to construct the representation of the generators of the hypersurface deformation on the Hilbert space of quantum gravity and the uniqueness would imply that one 'only' needs to construct suitable operator versions corresponding to the (unique) super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum on the Hilbert space.

[1] e-mail address: rtibs@iisertvm.ac.in

In [1] it is implicitly assumed that there are no special symmetries present in the embedding spacetime and that the number of generators is the same as the dimensionality of the spacetime. Since classically symmetry reduction is exact, one might expect that irrespective of whether one starts with the surface deformation algebra for the full theory, obtains the unique representation following Hojman et. al. [1] and then imposes some symmetry – spherical symmetry for instance, or one starts with the surface deformation algebra of the symmetry reduced theory and then, following the procedure of [1], obtains the representation of the reduced model, one would end up with identical results. This, however, is not obvious and leaves open the interesting possibility that for spacetimes with symmetries, more than one representation of the surface deformation algebra might be possible.

In the present work we show that this is indeed the case and that for spherically symmetric spacetimes there are several inequivalent representations possible. We will find that even though the generator of the tangential deformation is the same as the one obtained for spherically symmetric general relativity, the generator for normal deformations, the super-Hamiltonian, is not unique. We construct the most general representation belonging to the class where the spherically symmetric Einstein-Hilbert theory is modified by the presence of $g_{\theta\theta}$-dependent factors. In this context we also highlight the fact that the method of [1], when applied to spherically symmetric spacetime, does not lead to the most general super-Hamiltonian within this class.

We also prove that the modified theory is *inequivalent* to the classical theory by showing that it is not possible to construct canonical transformation leading from one to the other. We also point out that the non-uniqueness does not correspond to including higher derivative/higher order curvature terms in the Einstein-Hilbert action, implying that, for spherically symmetric spacetimes, Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian is not the only Lagrangian quadratic in derivatives and giving a generally covariant description of the dynamics of the spacetime.

In fact, the possibility of such non-uniqueness was already noticed in [2] (and emphasized in [3]) in the context of certain loop quantum gravity (LQG) inspired corrections (see section 5 below) where a super-Hamiltonian incorporating certain LQG corrections along with a classical super-momentum continued to have the standard surface deformation algebra. However, in these works it was not explicitly explored whether these possibilities corresponded to a non-uniqueness of the theory or whether these LQG corrected models corresponded to the classical theory in disguise. The results of the present work will reveal that it is the former. In addition, we will show that the non-uniqueness is more general than the possibilities discussed in [2, 3].

In the next section we give a brief outline of the proof of [1] identifying the key assumptions of the proof and highlighting the possible freedom available in the representation of the generators of surface deformation. Section 3 briefly discusses the standard canonical formulation of spherically symmetric general relativity along with showing the explicit structure of the surface deformation algebra. In section 4, which is the main section of this paper, we present the most general non-classical super-Hamiltonian with $g_{\theta\theta}$-dependent modifications to the spherically symmetric Einstein-Hilbert theory and show that the Poisson bracket algebra with the non-classical super-Hamiltonian closes in the same way as with the classical super-Hamiltonian (note that here and below, by a *non-classical theory*, we only mean a theory not obtainable from Einstein-Hilbert theory and *do not* necessarily imply any quantum effects). We point out that the new Hamiltonian continues to follow the assumptions of [1]. We also prove that the theory with the new Hamiltonian is inequivalent to the classical theory by showing that one cannot obtain one from the other by a canonical transformation. To dispel

the feeling that the non-classical Hamiltonian is pulled out of a hat, in section 5, we briefly discuss the motivation behind it (in certain LQG inspired corrections to the classical theory for spherically symmetric spacetimes). We conclude in section 6 with a brief discussion of the results. In the notation used, Greek indices $(\mu, \nu ...)$ take on the values $(0, 1, 2, 3)$ and Latin indices $(i, j ...)$ take on the values $(1, 2, 3)$.

2 Summary of the proof of Hojman et. al.

The aim of the work of Hojman et. al. [1] is to obtain the canonical formulation of the general theory of relativity from plausible first principles, without going through the usual route of starting with the Einstein-Hilbert action. In the usual formulation, one starts with the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) metric obtained by splitting the spacetime metric ${}^4g_{\mu\nu}$ into the spatial metric g_{ij} on space-like hypersurfaces of constant t, the lapse function N and the shift vector N^i

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + g_{ij}(dx^i + N^i dt)(dx^j + N^j dt). \tag{1}$$

To obtain the canonical formulation the Einstein-Hilbert action is expressed in terms of the quantities defined on the three dimensional spatial slice and takes the form

$$S = \int \mathrm{d}t\, \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int \mathrm{d}t \int \mathrm{d}^3x N\sqrt{g}({}^{(3)}R + K_{ij}K^{ij} - K^2). \tag{2}$$

In the above equation G is Newton's constant, g is the determinant of the spatial metric, ${}^{(3)}R$ is the Ricci scalar for g_{ij}, K_{ij} is the extrinsic curvature of the hypersurface and $K = g^{ij}K_{ij}$ (and we take the cosmological constant to be zero).

The Hamiltonian of the theory is obtained by performing the Legendre transformation noting that since time derivatives of the lapse and the shift functions do not appear, they do not contribute to the Legendre transformation. Introducing the canonical momentum π^{ij} conjugate to g_{ij} and going through the standard procedure one finds that the action (2) (for pure geometrodynamics) takes the form

$$S = \int \mathrm{d}t \int \mathrm{d}^3x(\pi^{ij}g_{ij,0} - NH - N^i D_i), \tag{3}$$

where $H \equiv H(g_{ij}, \pi^{ij})$ is the super-Hamiltonian and $D_k \equiv D_k(g_{ij}, \pi^{ij})$ is the super-momentum.

This action when varied with respect to the canonical variables (g_{ij}, π^{ij}) leads to Hamilton's equations and when varied with respect to the lapse function N and the shift vector N^i gives the so called Hamiltonian constraint $H = 0$ and the diffeomorphism constraint $D_i = 0$. For consistency of the overall formulation, the constraints must be preserved from one slice to the next implying that they form a closed system under Poisson bracket.

This algebra turns out to have a definite structure and in fact mimics the algebra of the generators of deformations of a hypersurface embedded in a Riemannian spacetime (the so called hypersurface deformation algebra). If $H(x)$ denotes the generator of deformations normal to the hypersurface and $D_i(x)$ the corresponding generators for tangential deformations then we have

$$\{H(x), H(\tilde{x})\} = D^i(x)\delta_{,i}(x, \tilde{x}) - D^i(\tilde{x})\delta_{,i}(\tilde{x}, x), \tag{4}$$

$$\{D_i(x), H(\tilde{x})\} = H(x)\delta_{,i}(x, \tilde{x}), \tag{5}$$

$$\{D_i(x), D_j(\tilde{x})\} = D_i(\tilde{x})\delta_{,j}(x, \tilde{x}) + D_j(x)\delta_{,i}(x, \tilde{x}). \tag{6}$$

Note that the spatial metric g_{ij} explicitly enters relation (4) in raising the index on D_i. Hojman et. al. use the structure of this algebra as the basic principle on which to base the canonical theory. That is, instead of taking the Einstein-Hilbert action as given and arriving at the super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum obeying this structure, the algebra in (4)-(6) is taken as the starting point and one asks for the representation of the generators of the normal deformation H and the tangential deformation D_i on the geometrodynamical phase space (g_{ij}, π^{ij}).

The principle of path independence leads to the conclusion that these generators must obey the constraints $H = 0$ and $D_i = 0$. To construct the representation of the generator of the tangential deformations D_i, of the three closing relations above, only relation (6) is made use of. One first calculates the change in a dynamical variable F under a tangential deformation in two different ways - (i) using the relation $\delta F = \mathcal{L}_{\delta N^i} F$ and (ii) using the evolution equation

$$\delta F(x) = \int \mathrm{d}\tilde{x}\{F(x), H(x)\}\delta N(x) + \int \mathrm{d}\tilde{x}\{F(x), D_i(x)\}\delta N^i(x), \tag{7}$$

with $\delta N = 0$. On equating these one can find the functional derivatives of D_i with respect to the three metric g_{ij} as also with respect to the conjugate momentum π^{ij}. Use of certain integrability condition along with the closing relation (6) then fixes the form of the super-momentum.

To construct the representation of the super-Hamiltonian H one first uses the closing relation (5) to find that the super-Hamiltonian must be a scalar density of weight one. Using (7) to find the change in the metric g_{ij} under normal deformation ($\delta N^i = 0$) then shows that H should be a local function of the conjugate momenta π^{ij}. Next, assuming the argument of time-irreversibility it is concluded that H should be an even functional of momenta π^{ij} (in [4] it is shown that this assumption is not necessary when using the Lagrangian approach to construct the representation of the surface deformation algebra).

Finally, a series expansion of H is made in even powers of π^{ij} and the coefficients of this expansion (which are functionals of the three metric) are determined term by term using the closing relation (4). It turns out that the super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum have the same form as obtained from the canonical formulation of the Einstein-Hilbert theory. The only freedom available is a canonical transformation

$$\pi^{ij}(x) \to \pi^{ij}(x) + \delta\Lambda/\delta g_{ij}(x) \tag{8}$$

where Λ is an arbitrary scalar functional of the metric (and so that it does not depend on the labelling, it is actually a functional of the three geometry $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda[{}^3\mathcal{G}]$).

3 Canonical formulation of classical general relativity with spherical symmetry

In this section we recapitulate the essentials of the canonical formulation of spherically symmetric general relativity limiting ourselves (for simplicity) to vacuum spacetimes. This is followed by presenting the structure of the constraint algebra for these spacetimes.

For spherically symmetric spacetimes the ADM metric in (1) is

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -N^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + g_{xx}\left(\mathrm{d}x + N^x\mathrm{d}t\right)^2 + g_{\theta\theta}\mathrm{d}\Omega^2. \tag{9}$$

Here g_{xx}, $g_{\theta\theta}$ are the only dynamical variables and because of spherical symmetry these are functions of the time coordinate t and the radial coordinate x only. For the same reason, N^x is the only non-zero component of the shift vector. From (9) we read-off the metric on the spatial slice Σ:

$$\mathrm{d}s^2|_\Sigma = g_{xx}\mathrm{d}x^2 + g_{\theta\theta}\mathrm{d}\Omega^2. \tag{10}$$

Using this metric, the Lagrangian (2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \int \mathrm{d}x\Big[-\frac{(\dot g_{\theta\theta})^2\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{8GNg_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{\dot g_{\theta\theta}\dot g_{xx}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\dot g_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{4GNg_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N^{x'}\dot g_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2GN} + \frac{N^x g'_{xx}\dot g_{\theta\theta}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}} \\ &+\frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\dot g_{xx}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - \frac{N^x N^{x'} g'_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2GN} - \frac{(N^x)^2 g'_{\theta\theta}g'_{xx}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - \frac{(N^x)^2(g'_{\theta\theta})^2\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{8GNg_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N(g'_{\theta\theta})^2}{8Gg_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}} \\ &+\frac{N\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} - \frac{Ng''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + \frac{Ng'_{\theta\theta}g'_{xx}}{4G(g_{xx})^{3/2}}\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In this expression a dot represents derivative with respect to t while a prime denotes derivative with respect to x and the angular coordinates have been integrated over.

Using $\pi^{ij}(x) = \delta\mathcal{L}/\delta g_{ij}(x)$ we find the canonical momentum conjugate to g_{xx} and $g_{\theta\theta}$:

$$\pi^{xx} = \frac{-\dot g_{\theta\theta} + N^x g'_{\theta\theta}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}}, \tag{12}$$

$$\pi^{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{4GN}\left(-\frac{\dot g_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{\dot g_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N^x g'_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + 2N^{x'}\sqrt{g_{xx}}\right). \tag{13}$$

The pair $(g_{\theta\theta}, \pi^{\theta\theta})$ and (g_{xx}, π^{xx}) coordinatize the phase space of the theory and obey the Poisson bracket relations

$$\{g_{\theta\theta}(x), \pi^{\theta\theta}(y)\} = \delta(x,y), \qquad \{g_{xx}(x), \pi^{xx}(y)\} = \delta(x,y) \tag{14}$$

with all other Poisson brackets among these variables being identically equal to zero.

The (total) Hamiltonian of the theory,

$$\mathcal{H}_T = \int \mathrm{d}x[\pi^{xx}\dot g_{xx} + \pi^{\theta\theta}\dot g_{\theta\theta}] - \mathcal{L}, \tag{15}$$

is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_T &= \int \mathrm{d}\,x N\Big[-4G\sqrt{g_{xx}}\pi^{xx}\pi^{\theta\theta} + \frac{2Gg_{xx}^{3/2}(\pi^{xx})^2}{g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} - \frac{g'_{xx}g'_{\theta\theta}}{4Gg_{xx}^{3/2}} - \frac{g'^2_{\theta\theta}}{8G\sqrt{g_{xx}}g_{\theta\theta}} \\ &+\frac{g''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big] + \int \mathrm{d}x\, N^x\left[g'_{\theta\theta}\pi^{\theta\theta} - g'_{xx}\pi^{xx} - 2g_{xx}\pi^{xx'}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

From this expression we can read-off the so called Hamiltonian constraint

$$\begin{aligned}H[N] &= \int \mathrm{d}x\, N\Big[-4G\sqrt{g_{xx}}\pi^{xx}\pi^{\theta\theta} + \frac{2Gg_{xx}^{3/2}(\pi^{xx})^2}{g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} - \frac{g'_{xx}g'_{\theta\theta}}{4Gg_{xx}^{3/2}} - \frac{g'^2_{\theta\theta}}{8G\sqrt{g_{xx}}g_{\theta\theta}} \\ &+\frac{g''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big] \approx 0\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

and the diffeomorphism constraint

$$D[N^x] = \int \mathrm{d}x\, N^x \left[g'_{\theta\theta}\pi^{\theta\theta} - g'_{xx}\pi^{xx} - 2g_{xx}\pi^{xx'} \right] \approx 0. \tag{18}$$

Note that the classical super-Hamiltonian is quadratic in the canonical momenta and that the three metric appears with spatial derivatives of order at most two while the super-momentum is linear in conjugate momenta. These constraints obey the following Poisson bracket algebra

$$\begin{aligned} \{H[N], H[M]\} &= D[g_{xx}^{-1}(NM' - N'M)], & (19)\\ \{D[N^x], H[N]\} &= H[N'N^x], & (20)\\ \{D[N^x], D[M^x]\} &= D[N^x M^{x'} - N^{x'} M^x]. & (21) \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this algebra of constraints with the surface deformation algebra in equations (4)-(6) it is clear that the former is nothing but the latter (with spherical symmetry imposed) and provides the motivation for the work in [1] of reversing the standard procedure and arriving at the Hamiltonian of general relativity by constructing the representation of the generators of surface deformation algebra).

4 Non-classical Hamiltonian and representation of the generators of surface deformation algebra

We are now ready to construct the non-classical super-Hamiltonian which, though not derivable from the Einstein-Hilbert action, will nevertheless give a representation of the generator of deformations normal to the hypersurface. We will actually be presenting a whole class of theories where the non-classical super-Hamiltonian will have four functional degrees of freedom over the corresponding super-Hamiltonian derived from the spherically symmetric Einstein-Hilbert theory. The four functional degrees of freedom will be seen in the presence of four arbitrary functions of the metric coefficient $g_{\theta\theta}$. The super-momentum will continue to be the same as that for the Einstein-Hilbert theory.

We could have started by giving the motivation behind this Hamiltonian before actually writing it down. However, for our purpose the reason behind the super-Hamiltonian is only incidental and might work as a digression. For this reason, in the present section, we simply write down the new theory without motivating our construction and relegate the source of this construction to the next section.

We will, in fact, find it much more convenient to start with the Lagrangian for the non-classical theory and then pass on to the Hamiltonian via Legendre transformation. This way we will only have to work with the metric variables $(g_{xx}, g_{\theta\theta})$ and the corresponding 'velocities' (otherwise we would need to introduce a non-classical phase space a priori). When we perform the Legendre transformation, we would be able to see how the conjugate momenta differ from

those of the classical theory. The Lagrangian for our non-classical theory is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{L}} &= \int \mathrm{d}x \Bigg[\frac{A_1}{4GN}\Bigg(2N^{x'}\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}} + \frac{N^x g'_{xx}\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - \frac{\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}\dot{g}_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\dot{g}_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - 2N^x N^{x'} g'_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}} \\
&\quad - \frac{(N^x)^2 g'_{\theta\theta} g'_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Bigg) + \frac{A_2}{4GN}\Bigg(- \frac{(\dot{g}_{\theta\theta})^2\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{(N^x)^2 (g'_{\theta\theta})^2\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2g_{\theta\theta}}\Bigg) \\
&\quad + \frac{N(g'_{\theta\theta})^2}{4G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2} g_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Bigg(1 - \frac{\alpha_4}{2\alpha_5} + \frac{3g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{\alpha_4 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{3g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{\alpha_4 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5^2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\Bigg) \\
&\quad - \frac{N g_{\theta\theta}}{4G\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Bigg(\frac{\alpha_4(\alpha'_2)^2}{2\alpha_2^{7/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}} + \frac{\alpha_4(\alpha'_5)^2}{2\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{7/2}} + \frac{\alpha_4\alpha'_2\alpha'_5}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{5/2}} + \frac{4(\alpha'_2)^2}{\alpha_2^{7/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}} + \frac{4(\alpha'_5)^2}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{5/2}} + \frac{4\alpha'_2\alpha'_5}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}} \\
&\quad - \frac{2\alpha''_2}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}} - \frac{2\alpha''_5}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}}\Bigg) + \frac{N\alpha_3\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} + \frac{N g'_{\theta\theta} g'_{xx}}{4G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}(g_{xx})^{3/2}}\Bigg(1 - \frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} \\
&\quad - \frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\Bigg) - \frac{N g''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Bigg]. \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expression $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and α_5 are arbitrary functions of $g_{\theta\theta}$, whereas

$$\alpha_4 = \frac{\alpha_1\alpha_5}{\alpha_2} - 2\left(\frac{b_2}{\alpha_2} - \frac{b_5}{\alpha_5}\right)\frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2} \qquad (23)$$

and $\alpha'_i = (\mathrm{d}\alpha_i/\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta})g'_{\theta\theta}$. Furthermore,

$$b_2 = \frac{\alpha_2^2\alpha_5^2}{\left(\alpha_2\alpha_5 - \alpha_2 g_{\theta\theta}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} - \alpha_5 g_{\theta\theta}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\right)}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}, \qquad (24)$$

$$b_5 = \frac{\alpha_2^2\alpha_5^2}{\left(\alpha_2\alpha_5 - \alpha_2 g_{\theta\theta}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} - \alpha_5 g_{\theta\theta}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\right)}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}. \qquad (25)$$

And finally,

$$A_1 = 2B - \alpha_2^{3/2}\sqrt{\alpha_5}B^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_2}b_5 B^2 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5^{3/2}} - \frac{b_2 B^2 g_{\theta\theta}}{\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}}, \qquad (26)$$

$$A_2 = 2A_1 - 3\alpha_1\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}B^2 + 2\alpha_1\alpha_2^2\alpha_5 B^3 + 2\alpha_1 b_2 B^3 g_{\theta\theta} + \frac{2\alpha_1\alpha_2 b_5 B^3 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5}, \qquad (27)$$

with B defined as

$$B = \frac{\alpha_2^{1/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}}{(\alpha_2^2\alpha_5^2 + \alpha_2 b_5 g_{\theta\theta} + \alpha_5 b_2 g_{\theta\theta})}. \qquad (28)$$

It is easy to verify that the classical Lagrangian (11) is recovered for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_5 = 1$, which imply $b_2 = b_5 = 0$ and these in turn imply $\alpha_4 = B = A_1 = A_2 = 1$. Note that for dimensional reasons all the α's should be dimensionless functions of $g_{\theta\theta}$.

The momenta conjugate to the metric variables are

$$\bar{\pi}^{xx} = \frac{A_1}{4GN}\frac{(-\dot{g}_{\theta\theta} + N^x g'_{\theta\theta})}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}, \qquad (29)$$

$$\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta} = \frac{A_2}{4GN}\left[- \frac{\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}}\right] + \frac{A_1}{4GN}\left[2N^{x'}\sqrt{g_{xx}} + \frac{N^x g'_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - \frac{\dot{g}_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\right]. \qquad (30)$$

The phase space variables $(g_{xx}, \bar{\pi}^{xx})$ and $(g_{\theta\theta}, \pi^{\theta\theta})$ obey analogues of relations (14). Using (15) we find the (constrained) super-Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{H}[N] &= \int \mathrm{d}x\, N\Big[-\frac{4G\bar{\pi}^{xx}\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{A_1} + \frac{2GA_2(\bar{\pi}^{xx})^2 g_{xx}^{3/2}}{A_1^2 g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{(g'_{\theta\theta})^2}{4G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2} g_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big(1 - \frac{\alpha_4}{2\alpha_5} \\
&+ \frac{3g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{\alpha_4 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{3g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{\alpha_4 g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5^2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\Big) + \frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{4G\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big(\frac{\alpha_4(\alpha_2')^2}{2\alpha_2^{7/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}} \\
&+ \frac{\alpha_4(\alpha_5')^2}{2\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{7/2}} + \frac{\alpha_4\alpha_2'\alpha_5'}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{5/2}} + \frac{4(\alpha_2')^2}{\alpha_2^{7/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}} + \frac{4(\alpha_5')^2}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{5/2}} + \frac{4\alpha_2'\alpha_5'}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}} - \frac{2\alpha_2''}{\alpha_2^{5/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}} \\
&- \frac{2\alpha_5''}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{3/2}}\Big) - \frac{\alpha_3\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} - \frac{g'_{\theta\theta}g'_{xx}}{4G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}(g_{xx})^{3/2}}\Big(1 - \frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{g_{\theta\theta}}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}g_{\theta\theta}}\Big) \\
&+ \frac{g''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\alpha_2^{3/2}\alpha_5^{1/2}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big] \approx 0, \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

and the super-momentum

$$\bar{D}[N^x] = \int \mathrm{d}x\, N^x \left[g'_{\theta\theta}\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta} - g'_{xx}\bar{\pi}^{xx} - 2g_{xx}\bar{\pi}^{xx'} \right] \approx 0. \qquad (32)$$

Comparing with (17) and (18) we find that while the diffeomorphism constraint retains it classical form, the Hamiltonian is modified by the presence of $g_{\theta\theta}$-dependent functions. However, the important thing to note is that the super-Hamiltonian (31), like its classical counterpart (17) is quadratic in canonical momenta and that the spatial derivatives of the three metric are of highest order two.

Making use of the primary Poisson brackets it is straight forward, though quite a bit tedious, to verify that the above constraints have the same Poisson bracket algebra as that of the classical theory (19)-(21). This proves that what we have here is a representation of the surface deformation algebra. It remains to be seen whether or not this representation is equivalent to the classical representation given by (17) and (18).

According to Hojman et. al. [1], the only freedom in choosing the momentum conjugate to the metric is that given by equation (8). Comparing the momenta in (29) and (30) with their classical counterparts in equations (12) and (13) we find that they differ by

$$\bar{\pi}^{xx} - \pi^{xx} = (A_1 - 1)\left(\frac{-\dot{g}_{\theta\theta} + N^x g'_{\theta\theta}}{4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\right), \qquad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta} - \pi^{\theta\theta} &= \frac{(A_2 - 1)}{4GN}\left[-\frac{\dot{g}_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}} + \frac{N^x g'_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{g_{\theta\theta}}\right] + \frac{(A_1 - 1)}{4GN}\Big[2N^{x'}\sqrt{g_{xx}} + \frac{N^x g'_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}} \\
&- \frac{\dot{g}_{xx}}{\sqrt{g_{xx}}}\Big]. \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

As per (8), the rhs of the above expressions is to be identified with $\delta\Lambda/\delta g_{xx}$ and $\delta\Lambda/\delta g_{\theta\theta}$ respectively and, if the representation is unique, $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda[{}^3\mathcal{G}]$, a functional only of the three geometry ${}^3\mathcal{G}$. However, the rhs of both (33) and (34) explicitly depends on the time derivative of the metric components and these, using (29) and (30), can always be expressed in terms of the momentum $\bar{\pi}^{xx}$ and $\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta}$.

This explicit dependence of Λ (or of the difference between the new and the old momenta) on $(\bar{\pi}^{xx}, \bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta})$ means that its Poisson bracket with the metric variables $(g_{xx}, g_{\theta\theta})$ does not vanish. If the two representations were equivalent (and, thus, related by a canonical transformation) this Poisson bracket will have to vanish since both the new and the old momenta have identical Poisson brackets with the metric variables. This proves that the representation of the surface deformation algebra as given by the super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum in (31) and (32) is inequivalent to the representation obtained by starting with the spherically reduced Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian and given in (17) and (18).

The Lagrangian in (22) (or the Hamiltonian in (31)) looks complicated. This, however, is only because of the considerable freedom that is present in the form of arbitrary functions of $g_{\theta\theta}$. To see things in a simpler context consider the special case where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$ and $\alpha_2 = \alpha_5 = 1$. For this case (23) gives $\alpha_4 = \alpha$, while (24) and (25) give $b_2 = b_5 = 0$. Equation (28) then implies $B = 1$ and this when used in (26) and (27) leads to $A_1 = 1$ and $A_2 = (2-\alpha)$. The Hamiltonian (31) now takes the considerably simpler form

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{H}_1[N] &= \int \mathrm{d}x N\Big[-4GN\sqrt{g_{xx}}\bar{\pi}^{xx}\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta} + (2-\alpha)\frac{2G(g_{xx})^{3/2}(\bar{\pi}^{xx})^2}{g_{\theta\theta}} - \frac{\alpha\sqrt{g_{xx}}}{2G} \\ &\quad -(2-\alpha)\frac{(g'_{\theta\theta})^2}{8Gg_{\theta\theta}\sqrt{g_{xx}}} + \frac{g''_{\theta\theta}}{2G\sqrt{g_{xx}}} - \frac{g'_{\theta\theta}g'_{xx}}{4Gg_{xx}^{3/2}}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Because $A_1 = 1$, the difference between the classical and non-classical momentum in (33) becomes zero, while that in (34) becomes

$$\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta} - \pi^{\theta\theta} = (1-\alpha)\frac{(-\dot{g}_{\theta\theta} + N^x g'_{\theta\theta})}{4GNg_{\theta\theta}}\sqrt{g_{xx}} = (1-\alpha)\frac{g_{xx}}{g_{\theta\theta}}\bar{\pi}^{xx}. \tag{36}$$

Although from the general case we already know that the representation provided by the example under consideration is inequivalent to the classical representation, for this simpler case, the in-equivalence of representations can be seen very easily. First note that of the four phase space coordinates, only $\bar{\pi}^{\theta\theta}$ has changed, the change depending not only on $g_{\theta\theta}$ but also on $(g_{xx}, \bar{\pi}^{xx})$. Had the rhs of (36) depended only on $g_{\theta\theta}$, we could have easily constructed a canonical transformation leading back to the classical phase space (say, using a generating function $F_3 = -\bar{g}_{\theta\theta}\pi^{\theta\theta} + G[\bar{g}_{\theta\theta}]$). However, the fact that there is dependence on $(g_{xx}, \bar{\pi}^{xx})$ as well, implies that any canonical transformation will affect more than one phase space coordinates, which proves that what we have here is a non-classical theory.

(Another case almost similar to the present one is where everything is the same as in the example just considered except that $\alpha_1 = \alpha \neq \alpha_3$. In this case the only change occurs in the last term on the first line of (35) where α gets replaced by α_3.)

4.1 Inclusion of matter

So far we have confined our attention to vacuum spacetimes. However, incorporation of matter is straight forward and will in fact bring in additional $g_{\theta\theta}$ dependent functional degree of freedom. For instance, for spherically symmetric Maxwell field minimally coupled to gravity, the classical (matter) super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum are

$$H_{EM}[N] = \int \mathrm{d}x N\frac{2\pi\sqrt{g_{xx}}(p^x)^2}{g_{\theta\theta}}, \tag{37}$$

$$D_{EM}[N^x] = -4\pi\int \mathrm{d}x N^x A_x p^{x'}. \tag{38}$$

In the above expressions p^x is the momenta canonically conjugate to the radial component of the field A_x such that $\{A_x(x), p^x(y)\} = \delta(x,y)/4\pi$ (other two spatial components $A_\phi = A_\theta = 0$ because of spherical symmetry).

Now it turns out that even the non-classical matter Hamiltonian

$$\bar{H}_{EM}[N] = \int \mathrm{d}x N \frac{2\pi\alpha_7\sqrt{g_{xx}}(p^x)^2}{g_{\theta\theta}}, \tag{39}$$

(where α_7 is yet another arbitrary function of $g_{\theta\theta}$) when appended to the non-classical gravitational Hamiltonian (31) satisfies the surface deformation algebra of equations (4)-(6) showing that non-uniqueness of representation is not limited to vacuum spacetimes.

5 Motivation for the non-classical representation: Inverse triad corrections in LQG

In the previous section we directly presented the most general spherically symmetric super-Hamiltonian which (along with the classical super-momentum) gives the most general representation of the surface deformation algebra. We did not discuss how the Lagrangian (22) (equivalently the Hamiltonian (31)) was obtained. In this section we fill this gap and show that the motivation behind the constructions of the previous section lies in a class of LQG corrections known as the inverse triad corrections.

In LQG, the classical theory is first recast in terms of the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Ashtekar variables. Here we briefly recollect the formulas for spherically symmetric vacuum spacetimes which will be of immediate relevance to us (details can be found in [5, 6]). As in the standard ADM formalism, the phase space is four dimensional and is coordinatized by canonical variables (K_φ, E^φ) and (K_x, E^x) obeying the commutation relations

$$\{K_\varphi(x), E^\varphi(y)\} = G\delta(x,y), \qquad \{K_x(x), E^x(y)\} = 2G\delta(x,y). \tag{40}$$

Here (K_φ, K_x) are related to the extrinsic curvature components K_{ab} of the standard canonical formulation of the classical theory and (E^φ, E^x) are the components of the densitized triads.

In terms of these variables the ADM metric is

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -N^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \frac{E^{\varphi\,2}}{|E^x|}(\mathrm{d}x + N^x\mathrm{d}t)^2 + |E^x|\mathrm{d}\Omega^2. \tag{41}$$

Comparing this expression with the one in (9) we see that the variables (E^φ, E^x) are simply related to the metric variables $(g_{xx}, g_{\theta\theta})$ (in the following we would be working in the regime $E^x > 0$ and therefore, the use of absolute sign with E^x would not be essential)

$$\begin{aligned} E^x(t,x) &= g_{\theta\theta}(t,x), \\ E^\varphi(t,x) &= \sqrt{g_{\theta\theta}g_{xx}}. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

In these variables and for vacuum, the classical Hamiltonian $H[N]$ and the diffeomorphism

$D[N^x]$, respectively, are:

$$H[N] = -\frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N\left[\frac{K_\varphi^2 E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} + 2K_\varphi K_x\sqrt{E^x} + \frac{E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{(E^{x'})^2}{4E^\varphi\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{E^{x''}\sqrt{E^x}}{E^\varphi} + \frac{E^{\varphi'}E^{x'}\sqrt{E^x}}{(E^\varphi)^2}\right] \approx 0, \tag{43}$$

$$D[N^x] = \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N^x\left[2K_\varphi' E^\varphi - K_x E^{x'}\right] \approx 0. \tag{44}$$

In LQG the presence of inverse components of the triad variable E^x in the Hamiltonian constraint (43) leads to certain corrections in the Hamiltonian (known as the inverse triad corrections) since the operator version of E^x has discrete spectrum containing zero and, therefore, cannot be inverted trivially. These corrections have been investigated in several works from a semi-classical point of view [7, 8, 2, 9] where it has been shown that their effect can be parameterized in the form of certain triad dependent functions $\alpha(E^x)$ (having a specific form upto quantization ambiguities and such that $\alpha(E^x) \to 1$ for $E^x \to \infty$, see [7]) such that the Hamiltonian takes the form [8, 3]

$$H^Q[N] = -\frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N\left[\frac{\alpha K_\varphi^2 E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} + 2\bar{\alpha}K_\varphi K_x\sqrt{E^x} + \frac{\alpha_\Gamma E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{\alpha_\Gamma (E^{x'})^2}{4E^\varphi\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma E^{x''}\sqrt{E^x}}{E^\varphi} + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma E^{\varphi'}E^{x'}\sqrt{E^x}}{(E^\varphi)^2}\right], \tag{45}$$

where to keep things general, different terms in the Hamiltonian are corrected by different functions α, $\bar{\alpha}$, α_Γ and $\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma$.

In keeping with the quantization procedure adopted in LQG, the diffeomorphism constraint is left unmodified and is therefore still given by (44). With these corrections to the Hamiltonian, the only element of the algebra which is non-trivial is the bracket between two Hamiltonians

$$\begin{aligned}\{H^Q[N], H^Q[M]\} &= D[\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma |E^x|(E^\varphi)^{-2}(NM' - N'M)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, \frac{K_\varphi E^{x'}}{E^\varphi}(\bar{\alpha}\alpha_\Gamma - \alpha\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma)(NM' - N'M) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, \frac{2K_\varphi E^x}{E^\varphi}(\bar{\alpha}'\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma - \bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma')(NM' - N'M).\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The other two brackets retain the classical form of (20) and (21). Comparing with (19) we find that the requirement of anomaly-free algebra imposes the condition that the last two terms on the rhs of the above equation combine to give zero (since they are not related to constraints)

$$(\bar{\alpha}\alpha_\Gamma - \alpha\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma)E^{x'} + 2(\bar{\alpha}'\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma - \bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma')E^x = 0 \tag{47}$$

However, even after imposing this condition, the constraint algebra does not acquire classical form since the first factor on the rhs in (46) explicitly depends on the correction factor $\beta \equiv \bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma$ which classically equals one.

Considering the special case $\alpha = \alpha_\Gamma$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha}_\Gamma = 1$, we find that not only is the condition (47) automatically satisfied, but also the constraint algebra retains the classical structure since $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma = 1$. This corresponds to the special case discussed in the previous section.

For the general case of (45), on the other hand, the constraint algebra is deformed. In [3] Bojowald et. al., following (and extending) the procedure of [1, 4], performed a detailed analysis to construct the most general representation based on the anomaly-free but deformed algebra

$$\{H^Q[N], H^Q[M]\} = D[\beta(E^x)|E^x|(E^\varphi)^{-2}(NM' - N'M)], \tag{48}$$

(other two Poisson brackets having the standard form). That is, like in [1], one forgets that the deformed algebra above can be obtained from the Hamiltonian (45) (with the α-functions related by condition (47)) and only takes the deformed constraint algebra as the input.

The conclusion of [3] was that the most general representation of the generator of normal deformations or the super-Hamiltonian for the deformed algebra is given by (45) with the correction functions α having the following form

$$\bar{\alpha} = \sqrt{|\beta|}c_1 \qquad \alpha = \sqrt{\beta}c_1c_2, \tag{49}$$

$$\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma = \mathrm{sgn}(\beta)\frac{\sqrt{|\beta|}}{c_1}, \qquad \alpha_\Gamma = \mathrm{sgn}(\beta)\frac{\sqrt{|\beta|}}{c_1}\left(c_2 - 4\frac{\mathrm{d}\ \ln\ c_1}{\mathrm{d}\ \ln\ E^x}\right). \tag{50}$$

In the above expression β, c_1 and c_2 are arbitrary functions of E^x. The absolute value sign and the sgn function occur because of the possibility of different orientations of the triads (a possibility we will ignore in the present discussion). Note that the above form of the correction functions is consistent with the requirement (47) for anomaly-free algebra.

It would seem that with a deformed algebra of constraints, there is no conflict with the uniqueness result of [1] since the uniqueness result only applies when the constraint algebra has its standard form. However, if we put $\beta = 1$, then the constraint algebra has the classical structure and the representation would be that of the classical surface deformation algebra. Putting $\beta = 1$ in (49) and (50) we find that the representation so obtained is not the classical representation (43) for which all the α's equal unity but depends on two arbitrary functions $c_1(E^x)$ and $c_2(E^x)$.

From the above analysis one would be tempted to conclude that in the presence of spherical symmetry, the method of [3] (or of [1] on which the analysis of [3] is based) would give the *most general* representation of the surface deformation algebra, and which, due to the presence of arbitrary E^x-dependent functions is not unique. However, below we show that this expectation is not correct and there exist more general representations of the surface deformation algebra for spherically symmetric spacetimes which are not captured by the procedure of [1, 3].

To get this more general representation we have to follow the procedure of [10] where it was shown that the non-classical constraint algebra in the presence of the inverse triad corrections (like the one in (48)) is only an artifact of the particular choice for the phase space coordinates and that with a suitable canonical transformation the constraint algebra can be rendered classical. Actually that work focussed on the special case where $\alpha = \bar{\alpha} = \alpha_\Gamma = \bar{\alpha}_\Gamma (\neq 1)$, for which the deformation factor in β in (48) equals α^2. The key observation in [10] was that if one performs a canonical transformation (using the generating function $F_3 = -\alpha^2 E^x \bar{K}_x$) so that

$$E^x \to \bar{E}^x = \bar{\alpha}^2 E^x, \tag{51}$$

$$K_x \to \bar{K}_x = K_x\left(\bar{\alpha}^2 + 2\bar{\alpha}E^x\frac{d\bar{\alpha}}{dE^x}\right)^{-1}, \tag{52}$$

not only the Poisson bracket between the two Hamiltonians but the constraint algebra itself takes the classical form.

We now generalize the above result to include arbitrary E^x-dependent modifications in the Hamiltonian (and these *need not* be arising from LQG or any other quantum theory of gravity). We will quote only the important formulas referring the reader to [10] for details. Consider the Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}[N] = -\frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N\left[\frac{\alpha_1 K_\varphi^2 E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} + 2\alpha_2 K_\varphi K_x + \frac{\alpha_3 E^\varphi}{\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{\alpha_4 (E^{x'})^2}{4E^\varphi\sqrt{E^x}} - \frac{\alpha_5 E^{x''}\sqrt{E^x}}{E^\varphi} + \frac{\alpha_6 E^{\varphi'}E^{x'}\sqrt{E^x}}{(E^\varphi)^2}\right], \tag{53}$$

which is the same as the Hamiltonian (45) except for two changes: (i) the functions $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}, \alpha_\Gamma$ and $\bar{\alpha}_\Gamma$ have been renamed as $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ etc. and, (ii) two additional functions α_3, α_6 have been included. The diffeomorphism constraint (44) is left unmodified. In the Poisson bracket algebra, only the bracket between two Hamiltonians is modified

$$\begin{aligned}\{\tilde{H}[N], \tilde{H}[M]\} &= \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, (NM' - N'M)\frac{E^x}{(E^\varphi)^2}\left[\alpha_2(2\alpha_5 K'_\varphi E^\varphi - \alpha_6 K_x E^{x'}) + 2\alpha_2(\alpha_5 - \alpha_6)K_\varphi E^{\varphi'}\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, (NM' - N'M)\frac{K_\varphi}{E^\varphi}\left[(\alpha_2\alpha_4 - \alpha_1\alpha_6)E^{x'} + 2(\alpha'_2\alpha_5 - \alpha_2\alpha'_5)E^x\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Note that the function α_3 does not appear in the above expression.

The algebra will be anomaly-free if

$$\alpha_5 = \alpha_6, \tag{55}$$

and

$$(\alpha_2\alpha_4 - \alpha_1\alpha_5)E^{x'} + 2(\alpha'_2\alpha_5 - \alpha_2\alpha'_5)E^x = 0. \tag{56}$$

Condition (55) was already assumed in (45) (and it also followed from constructing the representation of the deformed algebra in [3]) while condition (56) is the same as (47). This condition can be used to express one of the α's, say α_4, in terms of the others

$$\alpha_4 = \frac{\alpha_1\alpha_5}{\alpha_2} - 2\left(\alpha_5\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}E^x} - \alpha_2\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}E^x}\right)E^x. \tag{57}$$

Note that even after imposing these conditions we have four arbitrary functions $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and α_5 and the Poisson bracket between two Hamiltonians becomes

$$\{\tilde{H}[N], \tilde{H}[M]\} = D[\alpha_2\alpha_5 E^x (E^\varphi)^{-2}(NM' - N'M)]. \tag{58}$$

The algebra is thus deformed unless $\alpha_2\alpha_5 = 1$.

As in [10] we now perform a canonical transformation on the pair (K_x, E^x) using the generating function $F_3 = -\alpha_2\alpha_5 E^x \bar{K}_x$ depending on the new coordinate $\bar{K}_x$ and the old momentum E^x such that

$$\bar{E}^x = -\frac{\partial F_3}{\partial \bar{K}_x} = \alpha_2\alpha_5 E^x, \tag{59}$$

$$K_x = -\frac{\partial F_3}{\partial E^x} = \left(\alpha_2\alpha_5 + \alpha_5 E^x\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}E^x} + \alpha_2 E^x\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}E^x}\right)\bar{K}_x. \tag{60}$$

Interestingly, in terms of the transformed variables, the super-momentum retains its classical form

$$D[N^x] = \frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N^x[2K'_\varphi E^\varphi - \bar{K}_x \bar{E}^{x'}]. \tag{61}$$

The Hamiltonian constraint takes on the more complicated form

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{H}[N] \;=\; & -\frac{1}{2G}\int \mathrm{d}x\, N\Bigg[\frac{\alpha_1\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}K_\varphi^2 E^\varphi}{\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}} + \frac{2\sqrt{\alpha_2}K_\varphi \bar{K}_x\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}}{\sqrt{\alpha_5}}\left(\alpha_2\alpha_5 + \frac{b_2\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_2} + \frac{b_5\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_5}\right) \\
& + \frac{\alpha_3\sqrt{\alpha_2\alpha_5}E^\varphi}{\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}} - \frac{\alpha_4(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{4(\alpha_2\alpha_5)^{3/2}E^\varphi\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}}\left(1 + \frac{(\bar{E}^x)^2}{\alpha_2^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right)^2 + \frac{(\bar{E}^x)^2}{\alpha_5^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right)^2\right. \\
& \left. - \frac{2\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} - \frac{2\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} + \frac{2(\bar{E}^x)^2}{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\sqrt{\alpha_5}E^\varphi}\left(\bar{E}^{x''} - \frac{2(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right. \\
& - \frac{\bar{E}^x\bar{E}^{x''}}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} - \frac{\bar{E}^x(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^{x^2}} + \frac{2\bar{E}^x(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_2^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right)^2 + \frac{2\bar{E}^x(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_2\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} \\
& \left. - \frac{2(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} - \frac{\bar{E}^x\bar{E}^{x''}}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} - \frac{\bar{E}^x(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^{x^2}} + \frac{2\bar{E}^x(\bar{E}^{x'})^2}{\alpha_5^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right)^2\right) \\
& + \frac{E^{\varphi'}\bar{E}^{x'}\sqrt{\bar{E}^x}}{\alpha_2^{3/2}\sqrt{\alpha_5}(E^\varphi)^2}\left(1 - \frac{\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x} - \frac{\bar{E}^x}{\alpha_5}\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_5}{\mathrm{d}\bar{E}^x}\right)\Bigg],
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where in the above expression (b_2, b_5) are as defined in (24) and (25), respectively, but expressed as functions of $\bar{E}^x$. It is immediately obvious from the above expression that the modifications to the first three terms are algebraically independent and only takes a little more effort to see that in the remaining terms there is one more independent coefficient.

The important point is that under a canonical transformation the Poisson brackets retain their form except that the results are expressed in terms of the transformed variables. Since from (61) we know that the diffeomorphism constraint retains its classical form even after canonical transformation, the Poisson bracket (58) when written in terms of $(\bar{K}_x, \bar{E}^x)$ acquires the classical form

$$\{\tilde{H}[N], \tilde{H}[M]\} = D[\bar{E}^x(E^\varphi)^{-2}(NM' - N'M)]. \tag{63}$$

The other two Poisson brackets – $\{\tilde{H}[N], D[N^x]\}$ and $\{D[N^x], D[M^x]\}$ – continue to have the standard form. Thus, the constraint algebra, which was deformed in terms of the original variables (K_x, E^x), has become classical in terms of $(\bar{K}_x, \bar{E}^x)$.

In [10] it was further shown that the theory (which, for a deformed constraint algebra, does not have the covariance property of the classical theory under coordinate transformations) in terms of $(\bar{K}_x, \bar{E}^x)$ regains the classical general covariance if the metric corresponding to (9) is written not in terms of the original variables (E^x, E^φ) as in (41) but in terms of the variables $(\bar{E}^x, E^\varphi)$

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -N^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \frac{{E^\varphi}^2}{|\bar{E}^x|}(\mathrm{d}x + N^x\mathrm{d}t)^2 + |\bar{E}^x|\mathrm{d}\Omega^2. \tag{64}$$

Now we can see how the Lagrangian in (22) was obtained. We use the Hamiltonian (62) along with the diffeomorphism constraint (61) to obtain the equations of motion for $\bar{E}^x$ and E^φ. These are then used to eliminate K_φ and $\bar{K}_x$ from the Hamiltonian and the diffeomorphism constraint. Performing the inverse Legendre transformation, one then obtains the Lagrangian in terms of $(\bar{E}^x, E^\varphi)$ (and their derivatives). Finally, using the correspondence

in (42) (with E^x replaced by $\bar{E}^x$, as noted above) this Lagrangian can be written in terms of $(g_{\theta\theta}, g_{xx})$ leading to (22). In other words, the Hamiltonian (31) is nothing but the Hamiltonian (62) expressed in terms of the metric variables.

It is interesting to note that in this context, and for spherically symmetric spacetimes with the constraint algebra deformation factor depending only on E^x, the use of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Ashtekar variables seems to offer some advantage over the conventional metric variables. When using Ashtekar variables, the canonical transformation is to be performed only on the pair (K_x, E^x). However, in terms of the metric variables, because $g_{xx} = (E^\varphi)^2/E^x$, the canonical transformation would affect both the pairs $(g_{\theta\theta}, \pi^{\theta\theta})$ and (g_{xx}, π^{xx}) of conventional geometrodynamical phase space and, in general, it is more difficult to find a suitable canonical transformation when the number of variables involved is more.

6 Conclusions

According to the work of Hojman et. al [1], there is not much freedom as far as the *canonical* form that a generally covariant theory obeying the surface deformation algebra in equations (4)-(6) can take. For spherical symmetry, taking into account the inverse triad corrections in LQG it was found [8, 2] that the generators of the hypersurface deformation either obey the standard form of the surface deformation algebra, equations (4)-(6) or a deformed version thereof which, however, can be brought to the classical form following [10].

It is then an interesting question to ask as to what happens to the results in [1] – whether the resulting theory makes use of the very little freedom that is available (in the form of the metric dependent functional Λ in (8)) and thus falls within the purview of the result of [1] or does the imposition of spherical symmetry allows for more than one representation of the surface deformation algebra? We tried to answer this question in the present work and found that for spherically symmetric spacetimes the representation of surface deformation algebra is not unique.

We constructed the most general representation of the algebra such that the terms in the classical Hamiltonian are modified by arbitrary functions of $g_{\theta\theta}$. We had six arbitrary functions $\alpha_i, i = (1, 2, ..., 6)$ to begin with. Requirement of anomaly-free algebra brought this down to four arbitrary functions. At this level, the algebra, though anomaly-free, was still deformed. Following and generalizing the procedure of [10] we could absorb the deformation factor by a canonical transformation and this made the constraint algebra take on the classical form. Interestingly, the super-momentum (or the diffeomorphism constraint) retained its classical form even after the canonical transformation. The super-Hamiltonian, of course, took a more complicated looking form. Even then, the basic features of the classical super-Hamiltonian (and the ones used by Hojman et. al. in their proof) - it is quadratic in canonical momenta and is quadratic in spatial derivatives of the three-metric - continue to hold even for the non-classical Hamiltonian.

It was also seen that the construction based on the above method is more general than the method of [1]. The latter procedure was used in [3] to construct the representation (for spherically symmetric spacetimes) of the deformed algebra (48). The representation so obtained would give a representation of the standard surface deformation algebra when the deformation factor $\beta(E^x) = 1$. If this is used in the results of [3] one finds a representation involving only two arbitrary functions as opposed to four arbitrary functions of the previous paragraph.

In LQG, where these other representations were first obtained, concerns have occasionally been raised as to whether the different versions of the Hamiltonian, giving the classical constraint algebra are really different or are they equivalent to the classical Hamiltonian. We proved that the new representation is inequivalent to the classical representation. We also showed that the results continue to hold even in the presence of Maxwell field (obeying spherical symmetry) and it should not be very difficult to extend the result to include other matter fields like dust or scalar field.

Having demonstrated the non-uniqueness of the representation of deformations of hypersurface, one would like to know the possible implications of such a result. One implication is obvious - as far as spherically symmetric spacetimes are concerned, the Einstein-Hilbert action is not unique and there are functional degree of freedom available in the construction of the Lagrangian. It also raises the question whether similar freedom is available for other models with weaker symmetry – spacetimes with rotation, for instance? Ideally one would also like to understand if there is some geometric character to the generalized Lagrangian presented in (22). Unfortunately, so far we have been unable to do so. This should not be very surprising considering the fact that the modifications involve only one component $g_{\theta\theta}$ of the metric tensor.

Now a lot of interesting results and conclusions in classical general relativity and black hole physics are based on investigations of spherically symmetric models and make extensive use of the asymptotic aspects of the solutions of Einstein equations. For the alternative Lagrangians/Hamiltonians of the present work, the solutions of the equations of motion will be certainly different from those obtained from Einstein equations (and will depend on the specific form chosen for the α-functions).

By choosing these functions appropriately, one can make sure that even if the structure of the solution in the non-asymptotic regions is very different from that of the classical theory, the asymptotic structure of the resulting spacetime is the same as that for the solutions of the classical theory. For instance, in [2, 9] inverse triad corrected analogues of the Schwarzschild and Reissner-Nordström black holes with the aforementioned features have been obtained. Such a scenario opens up the possibility of classical, semi-classical and quantum investigations of these new class of models and offers an interesting comparison to their classical counterparts (even when these alternatives, unlike the classical model of (11) or (16), have not been arrived at from a more complete theory like general relativity).

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank A.P. Balachandran and Martin Bojowald for useful discussions and for there comments on the manuscript. This work is supported under DST-Max Planck India Partner Group in Gravity and Cosmology.

References

[1] S. A. Hojman, K. Kuchař and C. Teitelboim, Geometrodynamics Regained, *Ann. Phys. (New York)* 96 (1976) 88–135.

[2] M. Bojowald, G. M. Paily, J. D. Reyes and R. Tibrewala, Black-hole horizons in modified space-time structures arising from canonical quantum gravity, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 28 (2011) 185006, [arXiv:1105.1340].

[3] M. Bojowald and G. M. Paily, Deformed General Relativity and Effective Actions from Loop Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 104018 [arXiv:1112.1899].

[4] K. Kuchař, Geometrodynamics regained: A Lagrangian approach, *J.Math.Phys.* 15 (1974) 708.

[5] M. Bojowald, Spherically Symmetric Quantum Geometry: States and Basic Operators, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 21 (2004) 3733–3753, [gr-qc/0407017].

[6] M. Bojowald and R. Swiderski, Spherically Symmetric Quantum Geometry: Hamiltonian Constraint, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 23 (2006) 2129–2154, [gr-qc/0511108].

[7] M. Bojowald, T. Harada and R. Tibrewala, Lemaitre-Tolman-Bondi collapse from the perspective of loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 78 (2008) 064057, [arXiv:0806.2593].

[8] M. Bojowald, J. D. Reyes and R. Tibrewala, Non-marginal LTB-like models with inverse triad corrections from loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 80 (2009) 084002, [arXiv:0906.4767].

[9] R. Tibrewala, Spherically symmetric Einstein–Maxwell theory and loop quantum gravity corrections, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 29 (2012) 235012, [arXiv:1207.2585].

[10] R. Tibrewala, Inhomogeneities, loop quantum gravity corrections, constraint algebra and general covariance, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 31 (2014) 055010, [arXiv: 1311.1297].